	Case 3:07-cv-03357-JL Document 27	Filed 03/07/2008 Page 1 of 4
1	HANSON BRIDGETT MARCUS VLAHOS & RUDY, LLP	
2	ALLISON M. WOODALL - 178533 awoodall@hansonbridgett.com	
3	425 Market Street, 26th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105	
4	Telephone: (415) 777-3200 Facsimile: (415) 541-9366	
5	Attorneys for Defendants WESTMONT HOSPITALITY GROUP; WESTLODGE HOSPITALITY INC., WW SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT NORTH, INC.	
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
11		
12	BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SAN MATEO HOTEL EMPLOYEES AND	No. C07 3357 JL
13	RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES PENSION TRUST; SHERRI CHIESA, TRUSTEE,	DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
14	Plaintiff,	
15 16	v.	
17	WESTMONT HOSPITALITY GROUP, a corporation; WESTLODGE HOSPITALITY	
18	INC., a corporation; WW SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT NORTH, INC., a corporation doing	
19	business as TRAVELODGE and as TRAVELODGE SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT	
20	NORTH,	
21	Defendants.	
22		
23	Defendants WESTMONT HOSPITALITY GROUP, WESTLODGE HOSPITALITY	
24	INC., and WW SAN FRANCISCO AIRPORT NORTH, INC. hereby answer the First Amended	
25	Complaint ("Complaint") as follows:	
26	1. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to	
27	the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and on that basis deny each and every	
28	allegation contained therein.	

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

- 2. Defendants admit that Defendant WW San Francisco Airport North Inc. had been party to a collective bargaining agreement. Except as expressly admitted herein, Defendants deny each and every allegation of paragraph 2.
- Defendants allege that this paragraph states a legal conclusion to which no response is required; but to the extent a response is appropriate, Defendants admit that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over cases brought under Section 4301(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA) and Section 301(a) of the Taft Hartley Act. Except as so admitted, Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 and, on that basis, Defendants deny each and every allegation of Paragraph 3.
- Defendants allege that this paragraph states a legal conclusion to which no 4. response is required; but to the extent a response is appropriate, Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 and, on that basis, Defendants deny each and every allegation of Paragraph 4.
- 5. Defendants admit that Defendant WW San Francisco Airport North was party to a collective bargaining agreement with Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees Union Local 340 and that the collective bargaining agreement contained a provision regarding a pension fund for employees in the bargaining unit represented by the Union. Except as expressly admitted herein, Defendants deny each and every allegation of paragraph 5.
 - 6. Defendants admit the allegations of paragraph 6.
- 7. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 8. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 9. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

26

27

28

10. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.

- 11. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 12. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 13. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 14. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, on that basis, deny each and every allegation contained therein.
 - 15. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 15.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

First Affirmative Defense

The Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Defendants and each of them.

Second Affirmative Defense

The Complaint, and each and every claim therein, is barred (in whole or in part) because Defendants either were not the employer nor a member of the employer's controlled group when a withdrawal occurred.

Third Affirmative Defense

The Complaint, and each and every claim therein, is barred (in whole or in part) because Defendants are informed and believe and on that basis allege that the liability was calculated

DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Document 27

Filed 03/07/2008

Page 4 of 4

1429827.1

Case 3:07-cv-03357-JL